

**ORIGINAL**

**In the United States Court of Federal Claims**

Nos. 13-406C, 13-410C, 13-438C, 13-448C,  
13-449C, 13-450C, 13-451C, 13-452C, 13-453C

(Filed: July 3, 2013)  
**(NOT TO BE PUBLISHED)**

**FILED**

\*\*\*\*\*

)  
**CANDACE WILLRICH,** )  
                                )  
                                )  
                                )  
**Plaintiff,**              )  
                                )  
                                )  
                                )  
v.                             )  
                                )  
                                )  
**UNITED STATES,**            )  
                                )  
                                )  
**Defendant.**                )  
                                )  
\*\*\*\*\*

JUL. - 3 2013

**U.S. COURT OF  
FEDERAL CLAIMS**

**OPINION AND ORDER**

LETTOW, Judge.

Plaintiff, Candace Willrich, has filed nine complaints requesting monetary relief from the government in various amounts ranging as high as \$100 billion for alleged assaults upon her person and character, in addition to other alleged inflicted injuries. Plaintiff has requested leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in each of these docketed cases, representing to the court that she is currently unemployed, and that her cash assets are minimal, totaling significantly less than \$10,000.

**BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>**

Ms. Willrich alleges in these nine cases a variety of assaults upon her person, theft of her intellectual property, intentional misrepresentations to Ms. Willrich, defamation of her character, and disparagement of the reputation of her business. *See, e.g.*, Compl., Case No. 13-438C (entitled “Complaint for Attempted Murder on the Morning of June 25, 2013”); Compl., Case No. 13-410C (entitled “Complaint for Attempt to Stroke a Mathematician’s Brain”). These injuries have allegedly been inflicted upon Ms. Willrich by multiple persons, including but not limited to President Obama, Attorney General Eric Holder, the United States Secret Service, and

---

<sup>1</sup>This statement of the circumstances relating to Ms. Willrich’s claim is taken from her submissions and does not include any findings of fact.

Ms. Malia Obama. Mot. for Order to Seal Ct. Records, Case No. 13-406C at ¶¶ 10, 16; Compl., Case No. 13-410C, Ex. 1 at 5.

On June 17, 2013, Ms. Willrich filed her first case in this court, docketed as No. 13-406C. She filed the case docketed as No. 13-410C on June 10, 2013, and another docketed as Case No. 13-438C on June 28, 2013. The remaining six cases were filed in this court on July 1, 2013.

## ANALYSIS

### A. *Applications to Proceed In Forma Pauperis*

Contemporaneously with filing each complaint, Ms. Willrich submitted a motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. These applications are appropriately supported, and thus, for good cause shown, Ms. Willrich's applications to proceed *in forma pauperis* are GRANTED.

### B. *Jurisdiction*

The court may address jurisdiction *sua sponte* even if jurisdiction is not challenged by an opposing party. “[A] ‘court must satisfy itself that it has jurisdiction to hear and decide a case before proceeding to the merits.’” *Hardie v. United States*, 367 F.3d 1288, 1290 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (quoting *PIN/NIP, Inc. v. Platte Chem. Co.*, 304 F.3d 1235, 1241 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citing *View Eng'g, Inc. v. Robotic Vision Sys., Inc.*, 115 F.3d 962, 963 (Fed. Cir. 1997))). Under the Tucker Act, this court has subject matter jurisdiction over claims founded “upon the Constitution, or any Act of Congress or any regulation of an executive department, or upon any express or implied contract with the United States, or for liquidated or unliquidated damages *in cases not sounding in tort*.” 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1) (emphasis added). Because Ms. Willrich's complaints exclusively allege torts and do not draw upon any money-mandating statute, regulation or contract, the court does not possess subject matter jurisdiction over her claims. Accordingly, the court must dismiss Ms. Willrich's claims for lack of jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(1) of the Rules of the Court of Federal Claims (“RCFC”).

## CONCLUSION

The plaintiff's nine docketed cases are DISMISSED for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to RCFC 12(b)(1) because each allegation contained in these complaints sounds in tort. The clerk shall enter judgment in accord with this decision.

No costs.

It is so ORDERED.



Charles F. Lettow  
Judge